The A. F. of L. Weekly News Service gives news accounts and editorial interpretation of matters affecting labor occurring in the industrial, legislative and judicial fields, and contains other information of benefit to the trade union movement.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
WEEKLY NEWS SERVICE

Entered as second-class matter September 20, 1912, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized July 11, 1919.

Whoever knew Truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?—Milton.

WHOLE NO. 1288 | WILLIAM GREEN, President | WASHINGTON, D. C., SATURDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1935 | FRANK MORRISON, Secretary | VOL. 25, NO. 51

Wagner Act Is Attacked by Employers; Ogburn Defends Its Constitutionality

A. F. of L. Attorney Holds Measure Preventing Employers From Interfering With Workers' Rights to Organize and Bargain Collectively Is Within Power of Congress.

By A. F. of L. News Service.

Washington, D. C.—Anti-union employers have begun their threatened conspiracy to mobilize the courts of the United States against the constitutionality of the Wagner-Connery Labor Relations Act, which prohibits an unfair labor practices actions of employers interfering with the rights of working men and women to organize in bona fide trade unions and bargain collectively, including the promotion of company unions and discrimination against employes because of union membership.

Petitions to Federal judges for injunctions restraining the National Labor Relations Board from holding secret elections for chosing collective bargaining representatives have been filed in Detroit, Milwaukee and Washington, D. C. It is therefore instructive to review the opinion of Charles Ogburn, American Federation of Labor attorney, on the power of Congress to enact the measure in his brochure entitled "The National Labor Relations Act—Its Constitutionality."

Right to Organize

"The right of workers to organize into unions is a legal right they possess without regard to any Act of Congress," Mr. Ogburn declares. "This right has been recognized by courts of this country since 1842. What the National Labor Relations Act does is to forbid employers to interfere with this right of their employes and to self-organization and the selection by employes of representatives for collective bargaining. This is a very reasonable requirement and a conservative law."

With this simple reminder of the long-recognized right of employes to organize and bargain collectively, Mr. Ogburn sets down briefly and concisely why in his opinion the Act will be upheld by the United States Supreme Court if that court is asked to pass on the question of constitutionality.

Chief Justice Hughes Quoted

He points out that the Railway Labor Act which includes majority rule and the principal features of the National Labor Relations Act, has already been sustained by the Supreme Court. He found in the case of the Railway Labor Act, there is no right of private contract involved.

In the opinion which sustained the constitutionality of the Railway Labor Act, Chief Justice Hughes said: "The Railway Labor Act of 1926 does not interfere with the normal exercise of the right of the carrier to select its employes or to discharge them. The statute is not aimed at the right of the employers, but at the interference with the right of employes to have representatives of their chosing."

Since the principles embodied in the National Labor Relations Act have been sustained as applied to railroads which are clearly in interstate commerce, the question here involved is how broad a class of employers are to be included under the National Labor Relations Act.

Meaning of Interstate Commerce

Denying the validity of the objection that Congress has exceeded its power in attempting to regulate activities not in or directly affecting commerce, Mr. Ogburn says the operation of the Act is by definition limited to situations which are "affecting" commerce among the states.

"In reply to the contention that mining and manufacthring are purely local in their nature and therefore not subject to control by the Congress, numerous cases are cited to show how, in the past, such manufacturing industries have been held to be subject to Federal regulation. Without question the two most widely known cases on this point are the Coronado case and the case of the Danbury hatters.

In those great manufacturing industries which take coal, iron, cotton, or other raw materials from one State, process them in a second State, and ship them into other States, it is Mr. Ogburn's opinion that we have the very essence of what constitutes commerce among the States. In the Swift case Justice Holmes said in speaking of the operations of stockyards where cattle are sent for sale from one State to another and then after being slaughtered, to other States, that commerce thus existing is a current of commerce among the States and the purchase of the cattle is a part and incident of such commerce."

In the National Labor Relations Act it is the declared policy of the United States to eliminate the interruptions to this flow of commerce which have resulted from strikes involving destruction of lives and property.

Majority Rule

The importance of majority rule and the free choice of representatives is clearly illustrated according to Mr. Ogburn, by taking the case of two countries who seek to settle interunion common boundary through conference. If either set of delegates were controlled by the other country or if either country sent more than one set of delegates, such honest intent and purpose as where the boundary should be, it is clear that one country would have a decided advantage over the other. In that case the country represented by one set of delegates coming from outside influences would certainly get the best of the bargain.

We find here a striking parallel. Mr. Ogburn says, with the situation where an attempt is made to secure equality of bargaining power when the representatives of the employes are controlled by the management or where the representatives of the employes or the employes are denied the right to representation. The Congress recognized the anomaly in this situation and in the Act provided specifically against it.

This review touches only the high spots of Mr. Ogburn's brochure, which is well documented with citations from many court decisions on the questions raised by the Labor Relations Act and should be widely read. It may be obtained for 50 cents a copy from the American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.

HOLYOKE WIRE CLOTH CO. FOUGHT BY WIRE WEAVERS

Paper Makers' Unions Urged to Join Movement Against Concern's Attack on Organized Labor.

By A. F. of L. News Service.

Woodhaven, N. Y.—The National Executive Board of the American Wire Weavers' Protective Association has issued a vigorously worded statement to the organized paper makers urging them to join in a concerted opposition to the anti-union policy of the Holyoke Wire Cloth Company, of Holyoke, Mass., which recently not only refused to join with other wire cloth manufacturers in paying the union scale but actually locked out their union employes and decreed a heavy wage cut for power loom weavers.

The Executive Board's statement is entitled "An Appeal for Justice and Fair Play." It gives an account of the development of trade unionism among wire weavers and explains the controversy over the wage-cutting policy of the Holyoke Company. The text of the statement follows:

Origin of Wire Weavers' Union

"In or about the year 1845 the wire weaving industry was started in this country.

"It was started with weavers who had worked in shops in Europe. They carried it on with appreciable profit about the year 1876, at which time it had become quite an industry. The weavers thought they should have an organization. They organized but, due to many complications, the organization failed to function for any length of time.

"In 1882 there was a reorganization of the trade into a Protective and Benevolent Organization for the protection of the craftsmen. This same organization is still continuing to carry on the principles that were laid down for the trade in 1882.

"The above is a condensed history of our trade, and we base our appeal on it.

Agreements With Manufacturers

"Ever since we organized, our Executive Board has been doing business with the wire manufacturers through correspondence, and conferences on hours of labor, prices to be paid, and conditions under which we are to work.

"In June of this year we had a conference with the wire manufacturers and signed an agreement that was to run until January 1, 1937.

"Mr. Edward Docherty was present at the manufacturers' meeting but not at the conference, because he was not under contract with the manufacturers' labor committee with whom we conducted our negotiations.

"Mr. Edward Docherty repudiated his part of the agreement, and notified the weavers in his employ that if they wished to continue to work for the Holyoke Wire Cloth Company they would have to work for 20 per cent less than the other wire manufacturers agreed to pay.

Holyoke Company Fights Union

"Mr. George Docherty, the father of Edward, came to this country 50 years or so ago and held a position as a wire weaver under the protection of the weavers in the Protective Labor Association for years and years. He also was one of the sons who served their apprenticeship and became journeymen weavers, with the same protection and an opportunity for